

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/623,020 | 07/17/2003 | Darin Y. Furgeson | T9967.A | 4478 |
| 20450 75 | 90 04/13/2006 . | | EXAMINER | |
| ALAN J. HOV | | BADIO, BARBARA P | | |
| P.O. BOX 1909 SANDY, UT 84091-1909 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1617 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | App | lication No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/0 | 623,020 | FURGESON ET | FURGESON ET AL. | | | |
| | | Exa | miner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | | oara P. Badio, Ph.D. | 1617 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply | ation appears | on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence a | ddress | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu- period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu- ter to reply within the set or extended period for reply we reply received by the Office later than three months after an extended patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ILING DATE (f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nication. utory period will apply ill, by statute, cause | OF THIS COMMUNI on no event, however, may a y and will expire SIX (6) MOI the application to become A | CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | , | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1)□ | Responsive to communication(s) filed | on | | | | | | |
| | This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| ′= | ,— | | | | | | | |
| -, | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8)⊠ | ☐ Claim(s) 1-52 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9)[7] | The specification is objected to by the | Examiner | | | | | | |
| | • | | or b)☐ objected to | by the Examiner. | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | |
| , | 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| | Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notic 3) Inform | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT | Paper No(| s)/Mail Date | O-152) | | | | |
| Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other: | | | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/623,020

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-20, drawn to a composition comprising a polyethylenimine-sterol conjugate, classified in class 514, subclass 182+.
 - II. Claims 21-40, drawn to a complex comprising a nucleic acid and a polyethylenimine-sterol conjugate, classified in class 514, subclass 2+.
 - III. Claims 41-51, drawn to a process of making a polyethylenimine-sterol conjugate, classified in class 552, subclass 544.
 - IV. Claim 52, drawn to a method of delivering a nuclei acid into a mammalian cell, classified in class 514, subclass 2+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process for using, i.e., forming a complex with nucleic acid, the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product.

/

Application/Control Number: 10/623,020 Page 3

Art Unit: 1617

3. Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and process of using product made. However, in the instant case the process of using, i.e., for delivering of a nucleic acid into a mammalian cell, can be practiced with another materially different product.

- 4. Inventions I/II and III/IV are unrelated because they are drawn to different scopes of polyethylenimine sterol conjugates.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, from under the elected group *for search purposes*, even though this requirement is traversed. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Application/Control Number: 10/623,020 Page 5

Art Unit: 1617

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Telephone Inquiry

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara P. Badio, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0609. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara P. Badio, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1617

BB

April 11, 2006